

**In the United States Court of Federal Claims**

No. 25-661  
Filed: May 30, 2025

SHAKEEMAH ARYANAH RICHARDSON,

*Plaintiff,*

V.

THE UNITED STATES,

*Defendant.*

## ORDER

Plaintiff Shakeemah Richardson, proceeding pro se, brought this action in April 2025. ECF No. 1. Because she seeks leave to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2, the court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 in a previous order. ECF No. 5. There, the court determined that “dismissal is appropriate because Ms. Richardson has either failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted or this court lacks jurisdiction to hear her claims.” *Id.* at 3. The court ordered Ms. Richardson to show cause “why the court should not dismiss her complaint.” *Id.*

Since the court's show cause order, Ms. Richardson filed a motion to dismiss without prejudice because she now "concedes that this [c]ourt lacks proper venue and jurisdiction over her claims." ECF No. 7 at 1. Ms. Richardson acknowledges her claims for "constitutional deprivations, lack of due process, false claim[s] act, and extortion by county actors" arise under *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and the Federal Tort Claims Act. *Id.* She further recognizes that her claims "are not within the money-mandating contract or real-property-takings jurisdiction of this [c]ourt." *Id.* Accordingly, she moves to dismiss her claims without prejudice. *Id.* The court construes her motion as one under Rule 41(a)(2).

The court GRANTS Plaintiff's motion, ECF No. 7, and dismisses this action without prejudice and GRANTS the motion to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2. The Clerk's Office shall enter judgment accordingly.

It is so ORDERED.

s/ Edward H. Meyers  
Edward H. Meyers  
Judge